University of Groningen

Reversing Implicit Gender Stereotype Activation as a Function of Exposure to Traditional Gender Roles

de Lemus, Soledad; Spears, Russell; Bukowski, Marcin; Moya, Miguel; Lupianez, Juan

Published in:
Social Psychology

DOI:
[10.1027/1864-9335/a000140](https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000140)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2013

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

de Lemus, S., Spears, R., Bukowski, M., Moya, M., & Lupianez, J. (2013). Reversing Implicit Gender Stereotype Activation as a Function of Exposure to Traditional Gender Roles. *Social Psychology*, 44(2), 109-116. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000140>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Reversing Implicit Gender Stereotype Activation as a Function of Exposure to Traditional Gender Roles

Soledad de Lemus¹, Russell Spears², Marcin Bukowski³,
Miguel Moya¹, and Juan Lupiáñez¹

¹Universidad de Granada, Spain, ²University of Groningen, The Netherlands, ³Jagiellonian University, Poland

Abstract. We examined the influence of exposure to traditional gender roles on the activation of gender stereotypes in Spanish women. An associative procedure was used to expose participants to stereotypical vs. counterstereotypical gender roles, and a word categorization task with stereotypically feminine communal/warmth and stereotypically masculine agentic/competence trait words measured participants' automatic responses. Results show that women exposed to traditional roles reverse the activation of gender stereotypes. That is, they activated competence/agency faster for female primes and warmth/communion faster for male primes in a subsequent task. The implicit stereotype reversal was predicted by participants' endorsement of positive attitudes toward affirmative action policies. The results are discussed in terms of the motivational influence of perceived discrimination in intergroup relations.

Keywords: gender stereotypes, agency/competence vs. communion/warmth, gender roles, implicit measures

Introduction

Gender stereotypes are sets of shared beliefs and expectations about the perceived and prescribed characteristics of men and women (e.g., Fiske & Stevens, 1993). They differentiate between men and women on two key dimensions: Communion or expressiveness are more related to women, and agency or instrumentality are mostly related to men (Abele, 2003; Bem, 1974; Eagly & Steffen, 1984; Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Williams & Best, 1990). These overlap with the general stereotypical dimensions of competence and warmth (Eckes, 2002; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002) as well as with the fundamental dimensions of social judgment, i.e., agency and communion (Abele & Wojciszke, 2007). The complementary nature of gender stereotypes makes them particularly difficult to challenge, not the least because they may be perceived by women themselves as valid (Jost & Kay, 2005). However, there is also evidence that low-status groups (e.g., women) can contest and resist their stereotypic disadvantages (Becker & Wright, 2011; Mullen, Brown, & Smith, 1992; Schaller & Maass, 1989; Spears, Jetten, & Doosje, 2001; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Given that gender stereotypes justify the disadvantaged position of women in society, women have a vested interest in challenging them, but it is not clear that they are always able to do this, especially at the implicit

level (Lenton, Bruder, & Sedikides, 2009). Thus, previous research found that male primes facilitated the categorization of agency/competence related traits, whereas female primes facilitated the categorization of communion/warmth traits (de Lemus, Moya, Bukowski, & Lupiáñez, 2008). In this research we examined whether women's reactions to pervasive gender stereotypes at the implicit level are influenced by (counter)stereotypical roles relevant to gender stereotype activation, measured by a word categorization task.

Social role theory proposes that gender stereotypes reflect the distribution of men and women into social roles (Bosak, Szczesny, & Eagly, 2008; Eagly & Steffen, 1984; Eagly, Wood, & Diekmann, 2000; Wood & Eagly, 2002). Stereotypical social roles are predominant in society, making it difficult to contest them. For instance, by behaving counterstereotypically women risk social and economic penalties (i.e., backlash), which in turn can make an individual less willing to manifest stereotype-disconfirming behavior (e.g., Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992; Rudman & Fairchild, 2004; Rudman & Glick, 1999). This is also the case in Spanish college and nonstudent samples (García-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006, 2009). However, we should not necessarily assume that women always passively accept the discrimination implied by gender role distributions, as social changes in

modern societies demonstrate. Despite prevailing gender discrimination (United Nations, UNO Women, 2011), women have nearly attained equality with men in several formerly male-dominated fields (such as law or medicine), and as they take on male-stereotypic roles, women are increasingly adopting agentic attributes (e.g., Abele, 2003; Twenge, 2001). Some research has shown that exposure to such counterstereotypical exemplars either in reality (Dasgupta & Asgari, 2004) or via mental imagery (Blair, Ma, & Lenton, 2001) can reduce the activation of automatic gender stereotypes. As in many other Western countries, this prevalence of gender segregation at home and the workplace, as well as the contrasting tendency to increase female representation in male-dominated fields, is present in Spanish society today (Eurostat, 2006; Goñi-Legaz, Ollo-López, & Bayo-Moriones, 2010).

Exposure to counterstereotypical exemplars might influence the perceived stability or homogeneity of gender role distribution, suggesting that not all women (or men) behave stereotypically (see Lenton et al., 2009 for a meta-analysis). Further, the activation of gender stereotypes might also be contingent on other individual or situational factors such as egalitarian goals (Moskowitz, Gollwitzer, Wasel, & Schaal, 1999; Moskowitz, Salomon, & Taylor, 2000), interdependence goals (Bukowski, Moya, de Lemus, & Szmajke, 2009; de Lemus & Bukowski, in press), and motivation to control prejudice (e.g., Maddux, Barden, Brewer, & Petty, 2005). Most importantly, by adopting the target's perspective, research shows that members of low status groups are likely to resist and even challenge negative images of their group (e.g., Mullen et al., 1992; Schaller & Maass, 1989), especially when they are exposed to a clearly hostile and antagonistic representation of their own group (Becker & Wright, 2011; de Lemus, Spears, & Moya, 2012). Even at a more subtle level, women are able to overcome gender-related barriers, such as stereotype threat, by self-regulating their negative emotions and by reappraising the situation (Johns, Inzlicht, & Schmader, 2008). In this domain, retraining negative ingroup stereotypes is necessary to regain cognitive capacity critical for success (Forbes & Schmader, 2010). This result is consistent with our assumption that reversing stereotype activation might help to resist and challenge socially established gender discrimination. One way in which members of low status groups might initially confront status-defining stereotypes is precisely by rendering them less accessible.

We argue that, when the pervasiveness of gender stereotypes is made salient in the unequal and disadvantageous distribution of social roles of women compared to men, this resembles a condition in which competitive gender differentiation (which entails hostility toward women; Glick & Fiske, 2001) is blatant. Hence, it will motivate women to challenge those gender stereotypes even at the implicit level (see Becker & Wright, 2011; de Lemus et al., 2012). One way to simulate this gendered division of labor is by using an associative task to expose women to stereotypical versus counterstereotypical roles. Associative training has previ-

ously been used to successfully change or inhibit stereotypic associations (e.g., Gawronski, Deutsch, Mbirkou, Seibt, & Strack, 2008; Kawakami, Dovidio, & van Kamp, 2005, 2007; Kawakami, Moll, Hermsem, Dovidio, & Rusin, 2000). We use a similar associative paradigm to prime participants with (counter)stereotypical roles (i.e., women and men disproportionally appearing in the context of a kitchen or an office) and examine women's subsequent response latencies for agency and communion-related traits in a word categorization task. However, beyond seeking to change stereotypes following associative learning principles, we propose that women most strongly contest these stereotypical roles as applied to their group precisely when exposed to them, an effect we refer to as *motivated resistance*. That is, when traditional roles are emphasized, women are motivated to challenge them – which has a direct impact on basic social perception processes such as stereotype activation even at the implicit level. When women (the ingroup) are portrayed in high-status counterstereotypical roles (professional, workplace), this can reduce the classical gender stereotype activation pattern (see de Lemus et al., 2008 for a comparable sample), as prior research has suggested (Lenton et al., 2009). Hence, comparing a stereotypical exposure condition to a counterstereotypical one provides paradoxically a most conservative test for our motivated resistance hypothesis. Such a result would challenge the relative inflexibility of automatic stereotypes to interventions (Gregg, Seibt, & Banaji, 2006).

Overview of the Hypotheses

In the present research, we expect to find an overall effect of dimension (i.e., type of traits) such that warmth/communion-related traits are categorized faster than competence/agency related traits (Hypothesis 1), confirming recent findings on the primacy of communion in person perception in general (see Abele & Bruckmüller, 2011).

Further, following our motivated resistance approach, we argue that extended exposure to stereotypical roles activates a traditional gender differentiation that threatens women's gender identity. We predict that women will contest such stereotypic role relations by reducing or even reversing the stereotypes in a subsequent categorization task (Hypothesis 2). That is, women in the stereotype exposure condition will categorize agency-related words faster when primed with female faces (vs. male), and communion-related words faster when primed with male faces (vs. female).

Moreover, if stereotype reversal is motivated by egalitarian goals in social role distribution, the stereotype reversal effect should be moderated by attitudes toward gender equality policies (e.g., affirmative action in the workplace) (Hypothesis 3). For this purpose, we included an explicit measure of support for affirmative action (Tougas, Brown, Beaton, & Joly, 1995).

Method

Participants & Design

Eighty-five first-year female students from the University of Granada voluntarily participated in this experiment in exchange for course credit.

The experimental design was 2 (Exposure: stereotypical vs. counterstereotypical associations) $\times$ 2 (Gender prime: male vs. female) $\times$ 2 (Dimension: competence/agency vs. warmth/communion) $\times$ 2 (Valence: positive vs. negative). The first factor, Exposure, corresponded to the priming of gender roles (stereotypical: women in a kitchen, men in an office; vs. counterstereotypical: women in an office, men in a kitchen), which was manipulated between participants in the first categorization task (Phase 1: exposure phase). The other three factors, Gender target (gender of the face presented as a prime in the second categorization task), Dimension (content of trait words), and Valence (valence of trait words) were manipulated within participants in the evaluative priming task (Phase 2: test phase).

Materials

In the exposure phase (associative task), pictures of men and women with an emotionally neutral face were used as targets, appearing in three different contexts (kitchen, office, and neutral – an outdoor terrace). Two different pictures were used to represent each context. Pretest analyses showed that the office context was consistently rated as higher in status ($M = 4.21$) than the kitchen context ($M = 1.49$) on a 7-point scale, $F(1, 65) = 217.87$, $p < .001$. The same 6 persons (3 women and 3 men) appeared in the kitchen and the office contexts. Two different men and women appeared in the neutral context. In all the three contexts the person appeared in exactly the same posture, sitting next to a table (kitchen table, office table, or terrace table) from the waist up. In the kitchen context, the persons were wearing a white apron, whereas in the office context they were wearing a suit. The person appeared as naturally embedded in the context (the pictures were taken in real-life scenarios and then edited in the lab). He/she occupied approximately one third of the picture, and the context could be seen in the background. Pretest of the prime stimuli showed that the pictures in which a man ($M = 6.08$) vs. a woman ($M = 4.75$) appeared on a background of an office were seen as currently more prototypical in society, $F(1, 71) = 146.41$, $p < .001$. On the other hand, women ($M = 5.56$) vs. men ($M = 2.88$) were seen as more prototypical when they appeared on a background of a kitchen, $F(1, 71) = 72.70$, $p < .001$.

In the test phase (word categorization task), the images used as primes were faces of different men and women. The words used as targets were selected based on their differences in attributed agency/competence and communion/warmth, as well as positivity vs. negativity, from a

prior study using a similar sample of 149 Psychology students (Puertas, 2003). The stimulus used as targets were 8 agency/competence traits, 4 positive: perseverance, motivation, efficacy, intelligence, and 4 negative: discouragement, inconstancy, inefficiency, intransigence; 8 communion/warmth traits, 4 positive: kindness, understanding, sensitivity, friendliness, and 4 negative: antipathy, hostility, tactlessness, “lack of sympathy.”

Procedure

As a cover story, participants were told that the experiment was designed to study decision-making processes about social stimuli. In the exposure phase, they were told that the aim was to study the ability to inhibit categorical responses about pictures. In the test phase, they were told that the aim was to study word categorization.

Exposure Phase

Participants were asked to categorize the target person appearing in the image as a man or a woman *only* when the person appeared indoors (i.e., either in a kitchen or an office). They were told to withhold responses when he or she appeared outdoors (i.e., neutral context). The purpose of the task was to generate stronger associations between gender and a particular context. These instructions were designed to focus attention on both the context and the gender without referring explicitly to the gender-context association (Jiménez & Méndez, 1999). In 90% of the trials a person appeared either in a kitchen or in an office (45% each), whereas in the remaining 10%, the target appeared in a neutral context. Three men/women appeared in the kitchen and office contexts, and two different men/women appeared in the neutral context (the people differed to enhance the association between a specific person and specific occupational roles). The image of the context with a fixation point appeared for 1000 ms. The target person then appeared superimposed on it, until the participant gave a response within a maximum of 2000 ms. In the stereotypical exposure condition participants were exposed to 90% of traditional gender roles (women in a kitchen and men in an office); whereas in the counterstereotypical exposure condition participants were presented with 90% of nontraditional roles (men in a kitchen and women in an office). The proportion of men and women appearing in a neutral context was held equal (50/50%). Participants were presented with 160 trials in total.

Test Phase

Participants were asked to complete a categorization task in which they had to categorize a target word as positive or negative as fast as possible while trying not to make any

mistakes. Male and female faces were presented as primes and agency/competence and communion/warmth words as targets. At the beginning of each trial a fixation point (+) was presented for 1000 ms. The prime (man's or woman's face) was then presented for 28 ms. Therefore, participants had sufficient time to consciously process the image (i.e., supraliminal). After a 70 ms interval in which the screen was blank (SOA = 98 ms), the target word was presented for 100 ms. A blank screen appeared until a response was given by the participants up to a time limit of 900 ms. Hence, participants had a maximum of 1000 ms to categorize the word. Participants were presented with 3 blocks of 64 trials each.

After the test phase, participants completed a measure of attitudes toward affirmative action policies (3 items from Tougas et al., 1995; e.g., "If there are no affirmative action programs helping women in employment, they will continue to be unfairly treated"; $\alpha = .80$).

Results

Exposure Phase: Manipulation Check

The analysis of the responses during the exposure phase allowed us to check whether the associative task successfully produced a differential learning of the stereotypical vs. counterstereotypical associations. Data from 2 participants were excluded because they responded to fewer than 80% of trials during the training phase, leaving 83 female participants for analysis.

The mean RTs in phase 1 were introduced into a 2 (Exposure: stereotypical vs. counterstereotypical) $\times$ 2 (Gender target: male vs. female) $\times$ 2 (Role Context: kitchen vs. office) mixed ANOVA in which Exposure referred to the between groups manipulation, and Gender and Role Context referred to the characteristics of the pictures presented as targets in the associative exposure task (manipulated within participants). The results showed a significant interaction of Exposure $\times$ Gender target $\times$ Role Context, $F(1, 81) = 83.11, p < .0001, \eta^2 = .51$. As expected, exposure facilitated responses to the associations that were trained as shown in Figure 1. That is in the stereotypical exposure condition participants categorized men ($M = 630$) faster than women ($M = 751$) when they appeared in an office, $F(1, 81) = 27.05, p < .0001, \eta^2 = .25$, and they categorized women ($M = 622$) faster than men ($M = 713$) when they appeared in a kitchen, $F(1, 81) = 26.06, p < .0001, \eta^2 = .24$. By contrast in the counterstereotypical exposure condition the participants showed faster RTs for men ($M = 615$) than for women ($M = 682$) when they appeared in a kitchen, $F(1, 81) = 13.87, p < .001, \eta^2 = .15$, and for women ($M = 612$) than for men ($M = 702$) when they appeared in an office, $F(1, 81) = 15.19, p < .001, \eta^2 = .16$. These results indicate that the exposure phase successfully managed to associate

Figure 1. Participants' RTs to male and female targets in the gender categorization task primed by context (kitchen, office) during the exposure phase (Phase 1).

gender and context differentially. Therefore, the counterstereotypical condition managed to completely *reverse* (not only to reduce) role-congruent associations, creating a condition in which women are portrayed in the counterstereotypical higher status context.

Word Categorization Task

To measure the effects of the exposure manipulation on the automatic activation of gender stereotypes, we analyzed the responses of the participants to the word categorization task primed with male and female faces. Trials with incorrect responses (5.90%) were eliminated from the analyses. Trials with RT faster than 200 ms (1% of trials) were also discarded, considered as anticipations. The mean RTs per condition are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Mean RTs and SDs (in *italics*) for the test phase (word categorization task)

			Negative	Positive
Stereotypical exposure	Male	Competence	516	509
			48	48
		Warmth	505	466
	Female	Competence	508	498
			45	49
		Warmth	508	473
Counter-stereotypical exposure	Male	Competence	518	491
			55	52
		Warmth	510	456
	Female	Competence	514	490
			51	48
		Warmth	520	453
			48	43

As can be seen, there is a main effect of dimension, $F(1, 81) = 111.14, p < .001, \eta^2 = .58$, indicating that warmth/communion related traits were categorized faster than competence/agency related traits. This result is in line with Hypothesis 1 and replicates previous findings showing the primacy of processing of communal compared to agentic information (Abele & Bruckmüller, 2011).

Relative speed-scores were computed to avoid individual differences between the words used due to uncontrolled variables (frequency of use, subjective familiarity, etc.). These facilitation indices were computed by subtracting, for each participant, the average RT to each word from the corresponding RTs per experimental condition. For example, we computed the average RT to the word *efficacy* for all trials where it appeared (12 trials) and subtracted it from participants' direct RTs to each one of those trials. This way, a negative index shows a relative faster RT and a positive index shows a relative slower RT for that particular trial. Finally, we averaged these corrected indexes for each experimental condition (in the previous example, we averaged the indexes for efficacy, perseverance, motivation, and intelligence to get a global index of positive agency/competence activation). Average relative speed-scores per participant and condition were analyzed by means of a 2 (Exposure: stereotypical vs. counterstereotypical) $\times$ 2 (Gender target: male vs. female) $\times$ 2 (Dimension: agency/competence vs. communion/warmth) $\times$ 2 (Valence: positive vs. negative) repeated measures ANOVA, where the first factor was manipulated between participants, and the rest within participants. The results show an overall Gender target $\times$ Dimension interaction, $F(1, 81) = 9.55, p = .003, \eta^2 = .11$, indicating that female primes facilitate responses to agency/competence traits whereas male primes facilitate responses to communion/warmth traits. Further, there was a significant Exposure $\times$ Gender target $\times$ Dimension $\times$ Valence interaction, $F(1, 81) = 4.25, p = .04, \eta^2 = .05$. For the negative traits, there was no significant interaction of Exposure $\times$ Gender target $\times$ Dimension, $F < 1, ns$, therefore responses to negative traits were excluded from further

analyses. The analyses of the responses for the positive traits show a significant interaction Exposure $\times$ Gender target $\times$ Dimension, $F(1, 81) = 4.14, p = .04, \eta^2 = .05$, shown in Figure 2. When this interaction was further decomposed, a significant Gender target $\times$ Dimension interaction was found for the stereotypical exposure group, $F(1, 40) = 5.21, p = .03, \eta^2 = .12$, indicating that positive agency/competence tended to be activated more when primed with female faces than with male faces, $F(1, 81) = 3.58, p = .06, \eta^2 = .04$, whereas positive communion/warmth tended to be activated more when primed with male faces than with female faces, $F(1, 81) = 2.76, p = .10, \eta^2 = .03$. In the counterstereotypical exposure group there was no significant interaction of Gender target $\times$ Dimension for the positive traits, $F < 1, ns$. This result supports our Hypothesis 2.

Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action and Automatic Stereotype Resistance

Because exposure (stereotypical vs. counterstereotypical) did not influence the attitudes toward affirmative action (the relationship between the two is almost zero, $r = .05, ns$), we decided to test the predictive value of attitudes toward affirmative action on automatic stereotype resistance, moderated by exposure. An index for automatic stereotype resistance was calculated using the following formula (on positive traits only): [(Men, Agency/Competence) – (Women, Agency/Competence)] + [(Women, Communion/Warmth) – (Men, Communion/Warmth)]. This way, more positive outcomes show slower response to stereotypical associations (i.e., more activation of counterstereotypical associations, hence more resistance). This stereotype resistance index was regressed on the centered affirmative action variable, and exposure in Step 1, and the interaction between affirmative action and exposure in Step 2. Results showed that there was a significant effect of exposure, $\beta = -.23, t(82) = 2.08, p = .04, R^2 = .06$, with the stereotypic exposure condition predicting stronger stereotypic resistance, and the interaction of exposure and affirmative action was also significant, $\beta = -.21, t(82) = 1.95, p = .05, R^2 = .11$. Simple slopes analyses showed that affirmative action attitudes predicted automatic stereotype resistance for the stereotypical exposure condition, $\beta = .36, t(82) = 2.20, p = .03$, but not for the counterstereotypical exposure condition, $\beta = -.06, ns$. That is, in the stereotypical condition, the more participants held positive attitudes toward affirmative action policies, the more they reversed the activation of gender stereotypes. This result is in favor of Hypothesis 3.

Discussion

Our results show that participants generally responded faster to communion-related traits, thus replicating a pattern of the

Figure 2. Relative speed scores for the interaction of Gender $\times$ Content for positive traits. Lower indexes indicate faster RTs, more activation of those traits in each condition of the test phase (word categorization task).

primacy of communion in information processing (Abele & Bruckmüller, 2011). Most important, when our female participants were exposed to stereotypical roles, they reversed the classic gender stereotype activation pattern. That is, the stereotypical association of men with competence/agency and women with warmth/communion is challenged when traditional roles are emphasized. This is particularly the case for those women who endorse progressive beliefs (i.e., support for affirmative action), suggesting that such beliefs do indeed motivate them to contrast the stereotype. The stereotype reversal finding supports our hypothesized motivated resistance effect of women to pervasive or stable traditional roles, at the implicit level. In contrast, when a (progressive) change in the distribution of roles is suggested by the associative task, participants arguably no longer need to challenge and resist the stereotype. We are not aware of previous evidence for such an implicit contrast effect on stereotypes activation based on exposure to traditional roles (i.e., expected albeit aversive) stimuli.

This result is consistent with social cognition research that demonstrates that basic motivational processes can proceed unconsciously (e.g., Bargh, 1990; Bongers, Dijksterhuis, & Spears, 2009; Chartrand & Bargh, 1996; Fishbach, Friedman, & Kruglanski, 2003). Although the size of the effects found here is relatively weak, this seems not surprising in light of previous research on gender stereotype malleability (for a meta-analysis see Lenton et al., 2009). This lack of strong effects suggests that automatic stereotypes are relatively inflexible to interventions (Gregg et al., 2006). However, we expand those previous findings by providing evidence of implicit stereotype reversal in the context of traditional gender roles. Considering how resistant implicit stereotypes as a dependent variable seem to be, our effect, though small in size, is still of some theoretical significance (see Prentice & Miller, 1992). Also, further research with a high-status sample (men) in which exposure to stereotypical roles would reinforce their group identity is needed in order to determine whether the stereotype reversal effect shown in the present research is due to an identity threat for women as a group, or for egalitarian people in general (including both men and women who endorse egalitarian ideologies).

Despite these limitations, which should be addressed in further studies, the current research provides evidence for the suitability of the fundamental dimensions of person perception (namely, agency/competence and communion/warmth; Abele & Wojciszke, 2007; Fiske et al., 2002) as a form of contesting a discriminatory power-unbalanced social reality (as implied by roles distribution). For female participants, activating the association women-positive agency/competence after being primed with stereotypical roles, implies demanding for their own ingroup the most self-profitable traits (agentic ones) presumably needed to achieve their egalitarian goals. On the other hand, activating the association men-positive communion/warmth after stereotypical roles suggest that they are demanding other-profitable traits from the outgroup (communal ones) which

would probably imply support and understanding for the ingroup's goals (see Abele & Wojciszke, 2007).

Stereotypes can work as rationalizations or justifications for social roles distribution (e.g., Eagly et al., 2000; Hoffman & Hurst, 1990), they emerge and are strengthened in the course of sex-specific division of labor (Eagly, 1987; Wood & Eagly, 2002), and influence future achievements in professional as well as family-related roles (Abele, 2003). Being able to spontaneously challenge these stereotypes might be an important first step to overcoming such sexist discrimination. The results from this research suggest a form of contesting gender stereotypes at the implicit level by women threatened with traditional social role distributions. If the responses were not motivated by wanting to confront the stereotypes, the exposure to traditional roles should stimulate activation of gender stereotypes according to Eagly's sex role theory and mere exposure effects, whereas any change in the stereotype activation should only happen in the counterstereotypical condition. However, as extensive meta-analytic research shows (see Lenton et al., 2009) prior interventions based on these premises (e.g., counterstereotypical training) have only small effects, failing to reduce automatic stereotyping to zero and not giving rise to reliable counterstereotypic responding (Gregg et al., 2006). As our own results suggest, counterstereotypical training attenuates the activation of stereotypic associations regardless of participants' egalitarian beliefs (i.e., not moderated by their attitudes toward affirmative action); however, only stereotypical exposure manages to successfully reverse such stereotypes, especially when women endorse egalitarian goals. Perhaps focusing on interventions that attempt to manipulate participants' motivations can open up a more successful avenue for stereotype reduction. The moderating role of attitudes toward affirmative action on stereotype reversal in the traditional roles exposure condition provides further converging evidence for this motivational interpretation. Those women who agree with the fact that gender discrimination exists in the labor market, and that policies should help to confront that discrimination, are the ones most likely motivated to respond in a counterstereotypical way after being exposed to such unequal distribution of roles. This is among the first research to show motivated attempts to confront stereotypic role relations that occur spontaneously at the implicit level.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by a postdoctoral grant awarded by the Spanish Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia to the first author (BOE 31/07/2009), an ESRC Professorial Fellowship (RES-051-27-0261) to the second author, and by two grants from the Junta de Andalucía (Refs. SEJ-6225, P07-SEJ-03299). The authors would like to thank the Spears-Manstead labgroup for their insightful comments on different stages of this research, as well as the editor Andrea Abele and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful and constructive advice.

References

- Abele, A. E. (2003). The dynamics of masculine-agentic and feminine-communal traits: Findings from a prospective study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 768–776. doi 10.1037/0022-3514.85.4.768
- Abele, A. E., & Bruckmüller, S. (2011). The bigger one of the “Big Two”? Preferential processing of communal information. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 935–948. doi 10.1016/j.jesp.2011.03.028
- Abele, A., & Wojciszke, B. (2007). Agency and communion from the perspective of self versus others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 751–763. doi 10.1037/0022-3514.93.5.751
- Bargh, J. A. (1990). Auto-motives: Preconscious determinants of social interaction. In E. T. Higgins & R. M. Sorrentino (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition* (Vol. 2, pp. 93–130). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Becker, J. C., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Yet another dark side of chivalry: Benevolent sexism undermines and hostile sexism motivates collective action for social change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101, 62–77. doi 10.1037/a0022615
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Clinical and Consulting Psychology*, 42, 155–162. doi 10.1037/h0036215
- Blair, I., Ma, J., & Lenton, A. (2001). Imagining stereotypes away: The moderation of automatic stereotypes through mental imagery. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 828–841. doi 10.1037/0022-3514.81.5.828
- Bongers, K. C. A., Dijksterhuis, A., & Spears, R. (2009). Self-esteem regulation after success and failure to attain unconsciously activated goals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 468–477. doi 10.1016/j.jesp.2008.12.007
- Bosak, J., Szczesny, S., & Eagly, A. H. (2008). Communion and agency judgments of women and men as a function of role information and response format. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, 1148–1155. doi 10.1002/ejsp
- Bukowski, M., Moya, M., de Lemus, S., & Szmajke, A. (2009). Selective stereotype activation: The joint impact of interpersonal goals and task context. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 317–324. doi 10.1002/ejsp.585
- Chartrand, T. L., & Bargh, J. A. (1996). Automatic activation of impression formation and memorization goals: Nonconscious goal priming reproduces effects of explicit task instructions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 464–478. doi 10.1037/0022-3514.71.3.464
- Dasgupta, N., & Asgari, S. (2004). Seeing is believing: Exposure to counterstereotypic women leaders and its effect on the malleability of automatic gender stereotyping. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 642–658. doi 10.1016/j.jesp.2004.02.003
- de Lemus, S., & Bukowski, M. (2012). When interdependence shapes social perception: Cooperation and competition moderate the implicit activation of gender stereotypical associations. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 38, 1480–1495. doi 10.1177/0146167212454178
- de Lemus, S., Moya, M., Bukowski, M., & Lupiáñez, J. (2008). Activación automática de las dimensiones de competencia y sociabilidad en el caso de los estereotipos de género [Automatic activation of competence and warmth dimensions in the case of gender stereotyping]. *Psicológica*, 29, 115–132.
- de Lemus, S., Spears, R., & Moya, M. (2012). The power of a smile to move you: Complementary submissiveness in women’s posture as a function of gender salience and facial expression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 1480–1494. doi: 10.1177/0146167212454178
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109, 573–598. doi 10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.573
- Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A metaanalysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111, 3–22. doi 10.1037//0033-2909.111.1.3
- Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 735–754. doi 10.1037//0022-3514.46.4.735
- Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekmann, A. B. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. In T. Eckes & H. M. Trautner (Eds.), *The developmental social psychology of gender* (pp. 123–174). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eckes, T. (2002). Paternalistic and envious gender stereotypes: Testing predictions from the stereotype content model. *Sex Roles*, 47, 99–114. doi 10.1023/A:1021020920715
- Eurostat. (2006). 8 March 2006: International women’s day. A statistical view of the life of women and men in the EU25. Retrieved from <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=STAT/06/29&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>
- Fishbach, A., Friedman, R. S., & Kruglanski, A. W. (2003). Leading us not unto temptation: Momentary allurements elicit overriding goal activation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 296–309. doi 10.1037//0022-3514.84.2.296
- Fiske, S., Cuddy, A., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 878–902. doi 10.1037//0022-3514.82.6.878
- Fiske, S. T., & Stevens, L. E. (1993). What’s so special about sex? Gender stereotyping and discrimination. In S. Oskamp & M. Costanzo (Eds.), *Gender issues in contemporary society* (pp. 173–196). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Forbes, C. E., & Schmader, T. (2010). Retraining attitudes and stereotypes to affect motivation and cognitive capacity under stereotype threat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99, 740–754. doi 10.1037/a0020971
- Garcia-Retamero, R., & López-Zafra, E. (2006). Prejudice against women in male-congenial environments: Perceptions of gender role congruity in leadership. *Sex Roles*, 55, 51–61. doi 10.1007/s11199-006-9068-1
- Garcia-Retamero, R., & López-Zafra, E. (2009). Causal attributions about feminine and leadership roles: A cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 40, 492–509. doi 10.1177/0022022108330991
- Gawronski, B., Deutsch, R., Mbirkou, S., Seibt, B., & Strack, F. (2008). When “Just Say No” is not enough: Affirmation versus negation training and the reduction of automatic stereotype activation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 370–377. doi 10.1016/j.jesp.2006.12.004
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). Ambivalent sexism. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 33, 115–188. doi 10.1016/S0065-2601(01)80005-8

- Goñi-Legaz, S., Ollo-López, A., & Bayo-Moriones, A. (2010). The division of household labor in Spanish dual earner couples: Testing three theories. *Sex Roles*, 63, 515–529. doi 10.1007/s11199-010-9840-0
- Gregg, A. P., Seibt, B., & Banaji, M. R. (2006). Easier done than undone: Asymmetry in the malleability of implicit preferences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 1–20. doi 10.1037/0022-3514.90.1.1
- Hoffman, C., & Hurst, N. (1990). Gender stereotypes: Perception or rationalization? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 197–208. doi 10.1037//0022-3514.58.2.197
- Jiménez, L., & Méndez, C. (1999). Which attention is needed for implicit sequence learning? *Journal of Experimental Psychology-Learning Memory and Cognition*, 25(1), 236–259. doi 10.1037//0278-7393.25.1.236
- Johns, M. J., Inzlicht, M., & Schmader, T. (2008). Stereotype threat and executive resource depletion: Examining the influence of emotion regulation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 137, 691–705. doi 10.1037/a0013834
- Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2005). Exposure to benevolent sexism and complementary gender stereotypes: Consequences for specific and diffuse forms of system justification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 498–509. doi 10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.498
- Kawakami, K., Dovidio, J. F., & van Kamp, S. (2005). Kicking the habit: Effects of nonstereotypic association training and correction processes on hiring decisions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 41, 68–75. doi 10.1016/j.jesp.2004.05.004
- Kawakami, K., Dovidio, J. F., & Van Kamp, S. (2007). The impact of naïve theories related to strategies to reduce biases and correction processes on the application of stereotypes. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 10, 141–158. doi 10.1177/1368430207074725
- Kawakami, K., Moll, J., Hermsen, S., Dovidio, J. F., & Russin, A. (2000). Just say no (to stereotyping): Effects of training in the negation of stereotypic associations on stereotype activation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 871–888. doi 10.1037//0022-3514.78.5.871
- Lenton, A. P., Bruder, M., & Sedikides, C. (2009). A meta-analysis on the malleability of automatic gender stereotypes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 33, 183–196. doi 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2009.01488.x
- Maddux, W. W., Barden, J., Brewer, M. B., & Petty, R. E. (2005). Saying no to negativity: The effects of context and motivation to control prejudice on automatic evaluative responses. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 41, 19–35. doi 10.1016/j.jesp.2004.05.002
- Moskowitz, G. B., Gollwitzer, P., Wasel, W., & Schaal, B. (1999). Preconscious control of stereotype activation through chronic egalitarian goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 167–184. doi 10.1037//0022-3514.77.1.167
- Moskowitz, G. B., Salomon, A. R., & Taylor, C. M. (2000). Preconsciously controlling stereotyping: Implicitly activated egalitarian goals prevent the activation of stereotypes. *Social Cognition*, 18, 151–177. doi 10.1521/soco.2000.18.2.151
- Mullen, B., Brown, R. J., & Smith, C. (1992). In-group bias as a function of category salience, relevance and status: An integration. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 103–122. doi 10.1002/ejsp.2420220202
- Prentice, D. A., & Miller, D. T. (1992). When small effects are impressive. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 160–164. doi 10.1037//0033-2909.112.1.160
- Puertas, S. (2003). *Activación automática de los estereotipos asociados al poder y su medición implícita y explícita* [Automatic activation of stereotypes associated to power measured implicit and explicitly] (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universidad de Granada, Spain.
- Rudman, L. A., & Fairchild, K. (2004). Reactions to counterstereotypic behavior: The role of backlash in cultural stereotype maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 157–176. doi 10.1037/0022-3514.87.2.157
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (1999). Feminized management and backlash toward agentic women: The hidden costs to women of a kinder, gentler image of middle-managers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 1004–1010. doi 10.1037//0022-3514.77.5.1004
- Schaller, M., & Maass, A. (1989). Illusory correlation and social categorization: Toward an integration of motivational and cognitive factors in stereotype formation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 709–721. doi 10.1037//0022-3514.56.5.709
- Spears, R., Jetten, J., & Doosje, B. (2001). The (Il)legitimacy of ingroup bias. From social reality to social resistance. In J. Jost & B. Major (Eds.), *The psychology of legitimacy: Emerging perspectives on ideology, justice, and intergroup relations* (pp. 332–362). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Tougas, F., Brown, R., Beaton, A. M., & Joly, S. (1995). Neosexism: Plus ça change, plus c'est pareil. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 842–849. doi 10.1177/0146167295218007
- Twenge, J. M. (2001). Changes in women's assertiveness in response to status and roles: A cross-temporal meta-analysis, 1931–1993. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 133–145. doi 10.1037//0022-3514.81.1.133
- United Nations (UNO Women). (2011). *Progress of the world's women: In pursuit of justice 2011–2012*. New York: United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women. Retrieved from: <http://progress.unwomen.org/pdfs/EN-Report-Progress.pdf>
- Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1990). *Measuring sex stereotypes: A multination study*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Wood, W., & Eagly, A. H. (2002). A cross-cultural analysis of the behavior of women and men: Implications for the origins of sex differences. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 699–727. doi 10.1037//0033-2909.128.5.699

Soledad de Lemus Martín

Departamento de Psicología Social, Facultad de Psicología
Campus de Cartuja, s/n
18011 Granada
Spain
Tel. +34 958240925
Fax +34 958243746
E-mail slemus@ugr.es